DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 846 FL 020 891

AUTHOR West, Jonathan
TITLE The Development of a Functional-Notional Syllabus for University German Courses. CLCS Occasional Paper No. 32.
INSTITUTION Trinity Coll., Dublin (Ireland). Centre for Language and Communication Studies.
REPORT NO ISSN-0332-3889
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 54p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For Teacher) (052) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Second Language Programs; Course Descriptions; Curriculum Design; *Curriculum Development; Foreign Countries; *German; Higher Education; Instructional Materials; *Languages for Special Purposes; *Notional Functional Syllabi; Second Language Instruction; *Sequential Approach

ABSTRACT

It is argued that a functional-notional syllabus is practical and useful for second language instruction at the college level. It constitutes a natural progression from secondary school curricula that emphasize communication in that it uses the same basic organization and similar categories. However, it differs from them in that it pays particular attention to the complexity of speech acts and their organization rather than merely listing individual speech acts and appending a small section on dialogue structures. The notional functional syllabus also focuses on written rather than spoken language, a transition needed by students at this stage. These notions of continuity and progression should be carried through the college language curriculum. The syllabus might be designed in three stages to correspond to a conventional 3-year language sequence in which students progress from organizational to discursive and, finally, argumentative texts. A functional-notional syllabus can also integrate academic German into the regular language instruction program. A bibliography of 65 entries is included, and a list of functions and general and specific notions appropriate for a university German course is appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED352846

TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN

Centre for Language and Communication Studies

The development of a functional-notional syllabus for university German courses

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. G. Little

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Jonathan West

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CLCS Occasional Paper No.32

ISSN 0332 3889

Summer 1992

FL 020 891

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CLCS Occasional Papers

General Editor: D. G. Little

CLCS Occasional Papers report on research carried out within or in association with the Centre for Language and Communication Studies, and on research carried out elsewhere which is of special interest to the Centre's own concerns and activities. In some instances they present the texts of public lectures promoted by the Centre.

The following titles have been published and are available from The Secretary, Centre for Language and Communication Studies, Trinity College, Dublin 2.

Autumn 1981

1. D. M. Singleton, *Language transfer: a review of some recent research* (31pp.)
2. Jeffrey L. Kallen, *Linguistics and oral tradition: the structural study of the riddle* (33pp.)
3. D. M. Singleton, *Age as a factor in second language acquisition* (70pp.) - OUT OF PRINT

Summer 1982

4. Francis Nolan, *Voice quality and speech synthesis* (30pp.)
5. Roger Bennett, *Language elicitation procedures* (23pp.)

Winter 1982-3

6. S. M. Devitt, D. G. Little, S. P. O Conchúir & D. M. Singleton, *Learning Irish with Anois is Arís* (128pp.) - OUT OF PRINT

Autumn 1983

7. William T. Littlewood, *A communicative approach to language-teaching methodology* (19pp.)
8. Rose Maclaran, *On the interaction of semantics and pragmatics* (18pp.)
9. E. M. Harding, *Compensation strategies* (54pp.)

Autumn 1984

10. Jeffrey L. Kallen, *Generative phonology in the clinic* (38pp.)
11. Gearóid O Ciaráin, *The affective dimension in second/foreign language learning: an interactional perspective* (42pp.)

Spring 1985

12. D. M. Singleton & D. G. Little, *Foreign languages at second level: defining a syllabus, with particular reference to the needs of the senior cycle* (19pp.)
13. John Harris, *The polylectal grammar stops here* (12pp.)

Spring 1986

14. D. G. Little and A. J. Grant, *Learning German without a teacher. Report on a self-instructional programme for undergraduate students of Engineering Science at Trinity College, Dublin, 1982-1984* (60pp.)
15. Máire Owens, *Eithne: a study of second language development* (62pp.)
16. D. Wilson and D. Sperber, *Pragmatics: an overview* (36pp.)

(Continued on inside back cover)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CLCS Occasional Paper No.32
Summer 1992

The development of a functional-notional syllabus for university German courses[1]

by

Jonathan West

0 Preamble

Despite the fact that functional-notional syllabuses have been used over the past twenty years as the basis of a number of successful language courses (e.g. Trim and Kohl 1985, Hawkin 1986, Trim et al. 1987), they are not without their critics. They are said to be "phrase-booky" and limiting for course designers because they neither exploit the creative aspects of natural language nor respond to the needs of more advanced courses. It is argued below that this view stems as much from a misunderstanding of the purpose of a functional-notional syllabus as from a weakness in the concept itself. This paper therefore reviews functional-notional syllabuses and their implementation, and suggests how they might be modified for university use. In particular, it is proposed that complex activities such as "writing a report" or "composing a letter" can be described in a similar way to individual functions and that this approach to syllabus definition therefore provides a useful framework within which the target competence of university undergraduates can be described.

---

1 This is the revised version of a paper given to the Language Teaching Research Seminar, School of Modern Languages, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, 4 March 1991. It has benefited from suggestions by the participants, particularly from Dr P. Shaw (Language Centre) and Mr D. Westgate (Department of Education). I am further indebted to Mr D. G. Little and Dr Máire West, who read and commented on drafts of the paper.

The crux of the argument is that composing extended written discourse is just as much part of a language user's behavioural repertoire as are "identying oneself" or "expressing hope". Furthermore, because a functional-notional syllabus for university language courses is not fundamentally different to those which underlie existing outline syllabuses used for A-level and GCSE, its introduction would both ease the transition from school to university and maintain the continuity and progression already achieved by the schools syllabuses within the National Curriculum (DES 1990).

1 Definition of a functional-notional syllabus

Traditionally, syllabus definition has been directed towards providing a list of the forms of the language which a learner needs in order to use the language effectively. To illustrate this method at its most extreme, it is reasoned, for example, that the verb *to be*, the present tense of "regular" verbs, and "regular" nouns will be needed before, say, forms of the subjunctive, and the exponents of grammatical categories are presented in ascending order of assumed difficulty, supplemented either by exercises or with texts either authored or doctored by the compilers of courses.[2]

By contrast, functional-notional syllabuses begin with the assumption that the learner is learning the language to some practical end. They therefore provide a framework within which this can be achieved by specifying the linguistic behaviour a successful learner should be capable of at the end of the course. These behavioural objectives are expressed in terms of the communicative purposes (the functions) a successful learner should be able to fulfil and both the general concepts (the general notions) and the specific concepts (specific notions) he should be able to handle. Each function and

---

2 E.g. *Deutsch für die Mittelstufe* (Adler & Steffens (1974, 1975a, 1975b), *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* (Braun, Nieder and Schmöe 1973, 1974), *Deutsch x 3* (Griesbach 1974b), *Wie sag ich's auf deutsch?* (Kaufmann 1973), *Deutsch für Ausländer* (Kessler 1974), *Einführung in die deutsche Sprache der Wissenschaften* (Schade 1975), and *Auf Deutsch, bitte!* (Schulz et al. 1974). See the critique in Engel et al. (1981, I: pp.81, 97, 125, 160, 167, 191, 235). Readers will easily be able to add examples of their own.

notion is illustrated by a range of exponents: this procedure is outlined below. It is the practice of some authors to include an inventory of grammatical structures and a word list. This mode of presentation is followed in the German functional-notional syllabus *Kontaktschwelle* (Baldegger et al. 1984).

Examples of communicative purposes or functions would be EXPRESSING AGREEMENT / DISAGREEMENT, REPORTING AND DESCRIBING, ENDING A CONVERSATION and the like; and corresponding exponents *Das stimmt!*, *Er ist vor zwei Monaten nach England gefahren*, *Ich muß jetzt Schluß machen* (Baldegger et al. 1984, pp. 89, 68, 168). The concept of a communicative purpose grows out of the realization that when we use language, we do not use it just to debcribe our mental world: we use it to achieve some purpose. When we speak, we also do. This view of language use as a series of communicative acts was first described explicity by J. L. Austin in 1962 (Austin 1975) in a series of lectures eloquently entitled "How to do things with words". *Kontaktschwelle* specifies functions to exchange information, to express value judgements, to express feelings, to get things done, to socialize, to steer and organize discourse (Baldegger et al. 1984, p.29). The functions of a functional-notional syllabus can thus be seen within the general framework of speech-act theory (Little et al. 1985b).

If functions can be seen within the general context of speech-act theory, then notions may be seen in the context of what is conventionally called semantics, in so far as they refer to the way we as producers of language use utterances to relate both to the world around us and to the utterances we produce. General notions refer to concepts which are used irrespective of the topic of discourse (Baldegger et al. 1984, p.37). One example of these relations, also taken from *Kontaktschwelle*, would be the general notion PLACE WHERE —*wo*, *irgendwo*, *überall*, *hier*, etc. (Baldegger et al. 1984, p.179). Specific notions, on the other hand, are dependent on a particular discourse topic, so that what is included in this section depends very much on the use to which the language is being put. Texts used for digital electronics will require terms such as *modem*, *simplex*, *half-duplex*; texts used for economics will require terms such as *gross national product*, *inflationary gap*, and so on. This section in *Kontaktschwelle* is found as the last in the series of specific notions and therefore forms

a useful bridge between junior and senior cycle syllabuses.

A number of new-generation textbooks have appeared which exploit the functional-notional concept. Some of these have been successfully used at university level, often in courses for beginners.[3] Others, e.g. *Sprachbrücke* (Mebus et al. 1987, 1989), *Perspektiven* (Bansleben 1987a, 1987b), and *Themen* (Aufderstraße et al. 1983) are thematically organized and their debt to the functional-notional concept is less clear.

2 General characteristics of functional-notional syllabuses

Some of the problems which scholars have with functional-notional syllabuses derive from a misunderstanding of the aims of syllabus definition. It is important to bear in mind in the following description of functional-notional syllabuses and their implementation, that a list of functions and notions should not be confused with, nor is it a substitute for, actual teaching material. Furthermore, the process of syllabus definition is but one element in the wider process of curriculum development.

The first step in functional-notional syllabus definition involves a needs analysis (e.g. Richterich and Chancerel 1980; see also Berwick 1989, Brindley 1989). This specifies the likely circle of learners on the one hand and the use they are likely to make of their language on the other. For the compilers of *Kontaktschwelle*, to take one not untypical example, the target group are adults who intend to travel to German-speaking countries or areas for short periods and wish to speak to German speakers in situations unconnected with employment (Baldegger et al. 1984, p.17). It should be noted that other syllabuses (e.g. *The Threshold Level* and *Un niveau-seuil*) address slightly different target groups. Some authorities (e.g. Widdowson 1983) have seen the specification of needs as a factor which tends to limit language instruction to a process of training rather than education. Yet it is difficult to see by what other means the objectives of a course can be

3 E.g. *Deutsch aktiv* (Neuner et al. 1979, and others in the series), *Deutsch direkt!* (Trim and Kohl 1985); see also Götze (1990).

focussed, although it is clear that the relationship of training to education (see Widdowson 1983, pp.10f.) and syllabus to curriculum (see White 1988, pp.4ff.) are important issues which need to be addressed in a wider context.

The needs analysis determines the social domains and range of interlocutors the learners will be likely to encounter and the media they are likely to use, and these determine in their turn the list of functions and notions.

The first point to note here is that, as every communicative act incorporates at least one function (the speaker's/writer's intention) and one notion (a reference to an entity outside the utterance itself), functions, general notions and specific notions are interdependent in language use (Little et al. 1985a, p.1). For example, a sentence reporting the arrest of Winnie Mandela in South Africa:

> Die Frau des südafrikanischen Bürgerrechtlers
> Nelson Mandela, Winnie, ist am Montag unter
> Gewaltanwendung festgenommen worden

includes a function (reporting an event), a general notion (*am Montag*), and several specific notions (*südafrikanisch, Bürgerrechtler*). However, it is a mistake to ascribe to speech-act theory the maxim that a given exponent may be an exponent of only one function and that "the unexpected multifunctionality of speech [...] calls into question the monofunctionalism of speech act theory and its derivative, the functional-notional syllabus" (Swales 1989, p.85). No such constraint appears to exist. In any case, exponents simply represent likely realizations of functions and notions and do not "imply any necessary or fixed relation between linguistic form and communicative function" (Little et al. 1985, p.1). Neither should any element of the syllabus be seen as prescriptive in the sense that traditional grammars are often seen as being prescriptive: the choice of functions and notions is determined by the behavioural repertoire the learner is aiming at; the exponents simply provide a likely realization of the functions and notions. So there is nothing in the concept which suggests that functions cannot be realized in a variety of ways, or that two or more functions cannot be realized at once. Indeed, it may be necessary for texts to be understood on a number of levels.

However, the fact that many communicative functions are capable of being expressed with various degrees of sophistication does argue for a cyclical approach to syllabus definiton and, ultimately, to the course modules derived from the syllabus. It has been suggested that the term "spirals" would better capture the at once recursive and progressive nature of the process (Bruner 1977, p.13; Yalden 1983, pp.111f.). But we are in danger here of confusing the two separate processes of syllabus definition and its subsequent didacticization, although both should ideally modify each other within the development of the curriculum as a whole. In terms of the syllabus itself, there is no particular significance attached to the order in which the functions and notions are presented (Little et al. 1985a, p.1).

However, there are general implications for teaching. Because the syllabus is organized in terms of behavioural objectives, the teaching programme should aim to give students as much practice as possible, using authentic material (Little et al. 1985a, p.3) and using "activities that are integrated as fully as possible into the whole range of the student's literary and linguistic studies and are thus most likely to promote language acquisition" (Little 1981-2, p.6). In other words, in parallel to a language learning process in which linguistic structures are presented to students and consciously learned, this approach recognizes the importance of the largely unconscious language acquisition process as well (for this distinction, see Little 1981-2, p.2, Klein 1986, p.28). This in turn implies a change in the role of the teacher and learner: the teacher must accept a much less central role, the learner a much more active status in the learning process (Yalden 1983, pp.151ff., Little 1991). Another important implication for classroom realization revolves around the teaching of grammar: the organization of functional-notional categories has often created the impression that the explicit teaching of grammar is out of place. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is explicitly recognized that learners are helped by appropriate and apposite grammatical explanation. The difference lies in the fact that the teaching of grammar arises from rather than precedes the teaching of communicative functions (Little et al. 1985a, p.3). Again, this does not mean that authentic material cannot be introduced without sensitizing students to an important grammatical point if this is felt to be necessary:

it does mean that "grammar teaching which arises from 'communicative [...] functions' is seen as offering a form of systematic summary on the lines of most 'inductive learning', which characteristically concludes with a phase of explicit drawing together and consolidation of learning experience".[4]

3 List and characteristics of syllabuses to date

Up to now, a series of functional-notional syllabuses have been produced, largely under the umbrella of the Council of Europe. They include *The Threshold Level* (van Ek 1975), *Un niveau-seuil* (Coste et al. 1976), *Un nivel umbral* (Slagter 1979), *Kontaktschwelle* (Baldegger et al. 1980), *Drempelniveau* (Wynants 1985). By and large, they are intended for adult learners moving to another country and wishing to acquire a working knowledge of the language with a minimum of writing skills. Formal attempts, either to adapt the existing functional-notional syllabuses for school use (van Ek and Alexander 1977, Porcher et al. 1980), or to produce senior-cycle syllabuses (see Little et al 1985b, pp.49f., Singleton and Little 1985), are relatively rare, although most recent German GAFL materials, the report of the National Curriculum Working Party (1990), and most GCSE and A-level syllabuses are indebted to the concept.

To my knowledge there has as yet been no detailed attempt to examine the development of a functional-notional syllabus for a university course (but see Little 1981-2); the rest of this paper addresses this problem.

4 Features of a functional-notional syllabus for university language courses

So what features should a functional-notional syllabus for university courses have, and how would it differ from existing syllabuses?

---

4 Personal communication from Mr David Westgate.

4.1 The syllabus is part of the curriculum

First and foremost, a university language syllabus does not exist in a vacuum: it derives its legitimacy from the rest of the academic activities of the department. However, the development of new "German Studies" courses in university departments beside the traditional language-and-literature course has meant that any consensus which existed in the past regarding the "German Studies" curriculum has gone: departments are now engaged in a much wider range of teaching and research activities than those implied by the traditional course in language and literature. This means in turn that it is impossible at present to do more than suggest the broad areas a needs analysis would consider. These include the likely competence of students entering the course,[5] the academic work of the department—in other words, the language competence students must acquire to study their discipline effectively—, and, as all departments strive to ensure that their graduates are equipped with linguistic skills which will be useful to them in their careers, the range of uses students will put their acquired language to after graduation.[6]

This view of language teaching as an ancillary or service activity has important implications for the "training *versus* education" controversy. It is often argued that university courses are concerned with education and not with training: universities are not language schools. As far as the academic activities of a department are concerned (literature, history, linguistics, institutions, etc.), this is undoubtedly true. Yet a training element in university language teaching seems unavoidable, because university language courses do not stand alone as legitimate elements of a curriculum. For although the study of academic subjects can be seen as educational in that it

---

5 Singleton (1990) describes the TCD Modern Languages Research Project, the general aim of which is "to monitor the L2 development of university-level learners on a continuous basis and to examine the possibility of connections between these learners' L2 development and their previous educational and language learning experience" (p.1).

6 Information about this is scanty. Two studies which point the way forward are Firth et al. 1986 and Phillips-Kerr 1991.

encourages independent thought and "unexpected outcomes" (e.g. White 1988, pp.30-33), this is not necessarily true of the linguistic training which enables students to tackle them effectively. In short, there is no room for White's "unexpected outcomes" for learners of grammatical rules, or learners of essay or report technique. If the essay or report, or any one of the sentences which go to make it up, does not conform to the expectations of a native speaker of German, it will be at least questioned and probably rejected. Certainly, language teaching will ideally provide students with linguistic and study techniques which may be applied in other areas, but it will equally not lose sight of its service role if it is not to become a mere extension of the general language teaching now encouraged in schools.

In the absence of a detailed discussion within a department, it is impossible to specify detailed objectives for university language courses: but I have seen no more apt characterization of a modern language course than that offered by Little (1981-2, p.2), namely that the foreign language itself is an object of study. Furthermore, it would seem unexceptionable to require of students that they be able—in the target language—to distinguish between facts and opinions; that they be able to report facts accurately; that they be able to construct arguments on the basis of available data; and that they be able to do these things in whichever areas the department works. Apart from the survival skills which ideally will have been part of the school curriculum, the intercalated year abroad at a German university will require students, for example, to be able to understand formal lectures, to follow and take part in discussions in seminars, and to deliver and subsequently formally submit a seminar paper (*Referat*). As this activity usually takes place during the third year of a four-year course, instruction would most appropriately take place on the basis of a second-year syllabus. Final-year language teaching would also be closely tied to academic objectives, but may also be devoted to the study of specialized registers (for example, business and finance).

4.2 The syllabus is part of a cycle

So it is important to recognize that any university syllabus is part

of a cycle, and the university syllabus itself will undoubtedly need to be resolved into a number of cyclical components. It is in the first place impossible to achieve all desirable aims at once, even when a department has decided what these might be. In the second place, the importance of progression, improvement and refinement throughout a university course is no less than in any other area. Given the global objectives outlined above, it would for example seem prudent, as arguments proceed from the manipulation of facts, to ensure that students are able to report facts before they are introduced to argumentative structures.

Another important implication of the cyclical nature of functional-notional syllabuses is that they must also take account of students' previous learning experience, whether this was in new-style A-level courses or in *ab initio* courses at university. The competence of entrants to the course will be one of the most important factors in syllabus definition and course design. One consequence for these feeder courses is that they should ideally follow a defined-content functional-notional syllabus themselves; in the case of the German Department at Newcastle, this requirement is met in so far as the coursebooks used for introductory courses have been based on the Council of Europe's *Kontaktschwelle* syllabus (*Deutsch aktiv* 1-3). It is therefore easy to design a follow-on programme well-suited to the competence of students.

The situation for A-level entrants is not quite so promising: a glance at the Joint Matriculation Board syllabus reveals that even a progressive examination board has some way to go before its syllabus is specified in the degree of detail required. Some of the aims of the syllabus (e.g. 2 (a)—"communicate easily and with confidence in a German-speaking environment" and 2 (b)—"understand and appreciate spoken and written German from a variety of sources and in registers including colloquial, informative, literary") on the one hand describe a level of competence which so far exceeds that of the average A-level student as to be counterproductive and on the other are couched in terms which are too vague to be a useful guide for teachers, producers of course materials, or the learners themselves. The objectives of the examination are presented largely in functional terms (e.g. 1 (a)—"to seek information by asking questions"), but

there are only sixteen of these—(a) through (q)—compared with over ten times that number in the *Kontaktschwelle* syllabus. The range of spoken and written material is too large and diffuse to be an effective source of language acquisition outside the target country; reference to grammatical support is limited to "monolingual and bilingual dictionaries, good reference grammars" and is therefore unlikely to provide a coherent descriptive framework for learners. Moreover, CILT information leaflet No.10 (March 1988), "Patterns of change in GCE 'A' level examinations", suggests that the JMB syllabus is not untypical. The lack of a serious defined-content syllabus at school level means that first-year undergraduates display an unpredictable range of knowledge, and it is likely to present considerable problems in the implementation of such a syllabus at university. The preferred strategy to overcome this problem is to introduce communicative syllabuses with detailed learning objectives first at GCSE and then at GCE A-level. *Kontaktschwelle* is readily available as a model, and it is further suggested that, in the interests of compatibility, the same categorizations—and metalinguistic terminology—be employed in any realizations of a functional-notional syllabus for use in UK educational establishments, universities included. In the absence of a fully worked-out university syllabus, reference is made below to an appendix based on *Kontaktschwelle*.

4.3 The syllabus is text-based

The needs analysis, incomplete though it undoubtedly is in many respects, has already gone some way to providing a basis for a more detailed description of the behavioural objectives of our language syllabus. Functional-notional syllabuses which have appeared to date restrict their statement of behavioural objectives to relatively simple targets, e.g. "being able to introduce people to one another" (Little et al. 1985a, p.2). It should not be thought that university students no longer need these functions taught or reinforced on a more sophisticated level, so the principles of organization of a functional-notional syllabus for university use remain unchanged. But the activities required of undergraduates with several years' previous experience of the language are inevitably more complex.

Some work has been done on adapting functional-notional syllabuses for the production of extended written discourse (Singleton and Little 1985, pp.12-17, Little et al. 1985b, pp.13-17), but a syllabus for university use will need to elaborate on the structure of these activities more than has previously been necessary. It is particularly required of graduates that they concatenate speech acts to produce meaningful and cohesive texts. One objective of syllabus definition must therefore be to specify the texts which undergraduates will be required to produce, with the object of providing them with practical help in doing exactly that.

So, apart from the primarily oral repertoire which is the chief concern of traditonal functional-notional syllabuses, a syllabus for university courses will specify the types of both spoken and written text a successful student will be able to understand or produce at the end of the course and will also provide illustrations of this in the form of exponents. The choice of text types specified by a syllabus is a matter for the designers of that syllabus, and is in any case irrelevant for a discussion of the principles involved in syllabus design: let us assume that the syllabus includes the writing of newspaper texts. In fact, texts of this type are ideal for student use for a number of reasons: they are readily available; they provide a window on the political and cultural life of the target country; they are consistently structured texts and are therefore suitable for classroom study and reproduction; moreover, they provide examples of two text types which are models of the sorts of texts which handle facts and opinions: varieties of reports and commentaries.

4.4 The syllabus includes a description of complex functions

Once it has been decided which text types the syllabus will specify, the next question to be addressed revolves around the exponents for each type. These are presented in what for want of a better term have been called "text frames". The terminology recognizes the debt of the present approach to functional-notional syllabuses to developments in text linguistics and discourse analysis, in particular to Minsky's frame theory, which is a way of representing the background knowledge used in the production and understanding

of discourse (see Minsky 1975, especially pp.230ff., and Brown and Yule 1983, pp.238ff., for a discussion of this and related models). It is not suggested that text frames provide a model for text production and understanding: they merely specify the intentionality of the text type to be produced, the skeleton structure of the text (i.e. the characteristics of the opening, middle and closing sections), the exponents of this structure in terms of functions and notions, and the grammatical, semantic and textual features of the text. The frame theory is attractive because of its "slots" which are "filled" in any given instantiation of the frame.

One text type in which this can be seen clearly is the letter, as German letters are constructed in a highly conventionalized fashion. Indeed, secretarial schools formulate rules for business letters, which have consequently achieved a high degree of textual homogeneity. A German business letter, for instance, begins with the name and address of the sender (1), then follow the name and address of the recipient (2), the place (3) and date (4) of despatch, a brief characterization of the subject matter of the letter (*Betreff*—5), a reference to a previous letter, face-to-face conversation or telephone call (*Bezug*—6), an appropriate form of address (7), and a first sentence which either thanks the recipient for, or acknowledges the receipt of, a previous letter (8). The middle section of the letter typically consists of a simple function—for example, asking someone to do something, refusing someone permission to do something—couched in clear, impersonal terms; it may be necessary for the writer to give reasons for his action, in which case a simple argumentative structure is appropriate. The closing section consists of a final sentence (1), a greeting (2), and the signature of the letter-writer or a deputy (3). The text of a letter showing these elements is given on pp.14f.

The text frame of the letter as a whole, consisting of slots filled by appropriate functions and notions, is given in figure 1 on p.16. For the correct formulation of the name and address of the sender and recipient, the user is referred to *Kontaktschwelle*, SB (*Spezifische Begriffe*, "specific notions") 1 (PERSONALIEN: INFORMATIONEN ZUR PERSON) and then to SB 1.1 (NAME) and SB 1.2 (ADRESSE); if interest is in the types of firms which might be involved in such correspondence (*GmbH*,

OTFRID VON WEISSENBURG-STIFTUNG

Abteilung Förderung Ausland - Nachkontakte -

Dr. J. West
Department of German Studies
The University
Newcastle upon Tyne
GB - NE1 7RU

Notkerstraße 15
5300 BONN 4
Telefon (02 28) 000-0
Durchwahl (02 28) 000-___
Tx.: 0 00 000
Tfx.: (02 28) 00 00 00
Telegrammanschrift:
otfridbonn

Bonn, 21.3.1890

X - 1234Y

(bei Antwort bitte angeben)

Sehr geehrter Herr Dr. West,

bedingt durch meinen Jahresurlaub komme ich leider erst jetzt dazu, Ihr Schreiben vom 15. Januar 1890 zur Frage der Bereitstellung von wissenschaftlicher Literatur für Ihre Abteilungsbibliothek durch die Otfrid von Weißenburg-Stiftung zu beantworten.

Wir haben Ihren Antrag sorgfältig geprüft und ich freue mich, Ihnen mitteilen zu können, daß wir bereit sind, die von Ihnen benötigten Werke zu beschaffen, soweit sie durch den Buchhandel erhältlich sind. Da auf Ihrer Liste auch einige Titel erhalten sein können, die vergriffen sind, möchte ich vorsichtshalber schon jetzt darauf hinweisen, daß wir angesichts unserer vielfältigen Verpflichtungen in aller Welt keine antiquarischen Beschaffungen vornehmen können.

Wir werden jetzt alle lieferbaren Titel bestellen und sie dann über unsere Buchhandlung zum Versand bringen. Vor dem Abgang der Sendung werden wir Sie noch einmal gesondert benachrichtigen.

Prof. Dr. Bücherwurm wird der Einfachheit halber einen

Durchdruck dieses Schreibens erhalten.

Für Ihre weitere wissenschaftliche Arbeit wünsche ich Ihnen viel Erfolg und persönlich alles Gute.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen,

gez. Dr. Spendelfried
(Dr. Wolfram Spendelfried)

OHG, AG, KG, etc.)—for example, in a business studies course—a new section under SB 7 (ÖFFENTLICHE UND PRIVATE DIENSTLEISTUNGEN) would be needed. In a similar way, the boxes on the right-hand side of the page refer the user to the appropriate functions and notions to fill the slots on the left. For convenience, an English version of the functions and notions of *Kontaktschwelle* has been reproduced as an appendix to this paper; an asterisk indicates an addition to the original scheme.

As far as the middle section goes, it is firstly important to realize that features of this section are in fact characteristic of the text as a whole; in other words, the linguistic characteristics of this section overlay any opening or closing conventions which exist. Second, in the present state of textlinguistic research, we are some way from being able to present a fully-developed analytical strategy which will adequately capture the linguistic features of a single text, let alone a text type. Indeed, it has sometimes been suggested that the search for precise linguistic characterizations of texts is overly optimistic. This is the chief reason for my not being able to fully specify the features of business letters in the text frame, and this paper is certainly not the place to pursue such a large question. However, on the one hand it is undeniable that certain linguistic features are associated with certain text types and one the other that all linguistic forms—and therefore the linguistic features of a text—have a functional aspect, so it seems reasonable to try to capture at least some of these features in functional terms and incorporate them into our syllabus. In a

Figure 1

Text frame for writing a business letter in German



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

business letter, for example, the writer distances himself from the content of the letter by the use of the first person plural (*Wir danken für Ihr schreiben* [...]), the passive (*Ihre Reklamation wurde überprüft*), and the use of nominal as opposed to verbal constructions (*Sofort nach Wareneingang*, instead of a verbal construction such as *Gleich nachdem die Ware hier eingetroffen ist*; see Engel 1988, pp.173ff.). Clearly, progress must be made in the listing of text features proper to a given text type before a detailed syllabus can be published.

There are a number of ways in which the linguistic features of the text could be formally captured. Just because I have chosen Danes's (1964) three-level approach to syntax, which sees texts as having a range of syntactic, grammatical and textual features, does not imply that there might not be better ways of achieving this objective. It is simply a convenient provisional analytical tool. One roughly comparable alternative approach might be Sowinski's distinction between *Textpragmatik*, *Textsemantik* and *Textgrammatik* (Sowinski 1983, pp.64-124); a slightly different one might be the seven features of texts presented by de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981, pp.13f.). Work is currently under way on a scheme which will allow a synoptic description of textual features, including some not usually mentioned in the handbooks, such as length of sentence, morphological index, and so on; a device such as Weinrich's text score (in the musical sense—*Textpartitur*) could be used eventually to determine conventional staging strategies and the like (Weinrich 1972). These features will be taken up not only in the text frames, but also in the lists of functions and notions and in the grammatical inventory which will accompany a university syllabus.

A modified form of this text frame could be used to describe the structure of other types of letter, thereby bringing out more clearly the distinctions and common features of texts of a single sub-type. A personal letter, for example, would have a less elaborate opening section (elements 1, 3, 4, 7 and 8 would be needed), but the middle section would be more varied in structure, reflecting the diverse concerns of personal correspondents. The closing section retains the final sentence of the letter, the greeting and the signature. A postcard has the simplest structure of all, dispensing with the address of the sender and incorporating a small number of simple functions (space

is, after all, limited).

While letters show the principles involved in the text frame element of a functional-notional syllabus for university language courses, it could well be argued that this text type is more suitable for instruction in schools or in vocational courses. With this in mind, I now turn to two other text types which are more suitable for our courses: reports and commentaries.

The text type "short newspaper report" has been chosen firstly because we have some experience in using it with first-year students; second, because its structure is relatively simple; third, because examples of this text type are readily available; and lastly, because their subject matter coincides with one of the central concerns of a university language course, the study of the target country. As was the case with the letter, these texts too have an opening, a middle, and a closing section, consisting of slots which can be filled by structures which have features specific to the text type. A great deal more work needs to be done on German text grammar before it is possible to specify the full range of features specific even to a short report. Again, it can be shown that the range and type of speech act employed, certain linguistic features, and even the type of thematic progression employed correlate with text type (Sandig 1986; Engel 1988, pp.128f.).

The text of the short report is as follows:

(*FAZ*, 3. Januar 1991)

Hoher Offizier bei Anschlag in Spanien getötet

San Sebastian, 2. Januar (AP/dpa). Ein hoher spanischer Offizier ist am Mittwoch in seinem Wagen erschossen worden. Sein Fahrer blieb unverletzt. Die Täter, die mit Maschinenpistolen bewaffnet waren, konnten nach dem Anschlag unerkannt entkommen. Die Polizei vermutet, daß die baskische Separatisten-organisation Eta hinter dem Anschlag steckt. Bei dem Ermordeten handelt es sich der Polizei zufolge um den stellvertretenden Kommandeur des Militär-distrikts der Provinz Guipuzcoa, Oberst Lozano. Im

Figure 2

Text frame for writing a short newspaper report in German



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

vergangenen Jahr haben Terroristen der Eta 22 Menschen umgebracht.

A diagram of the frame associated with this short report is given in figure 2 on p.19. It specifies the opening, middle, and closing sections on the left-hand side of the page, progresses to their constituent parts, and finally, on the right, specifies—in terms of the lists in *Kontaktschwelle*—the functions and notions which could be used to realize them. In an actual syllabus, the range and complexity of the functions and notions presented in *Kontaktschwelle* will need to be modified.

The opening section consists first of a headline, which is in effect the main point of the news item: *Hoher Offizier bei Anschlag in Spanien getötet*. It is permissible in German headlines to omit the finite verb and certain articles. The function—including special features of headlines—which fills this slot is specified in section SA 1.1.3 (SA = *Sprechakt*, "speech act") of *Kontaktschwelle*.

Next, the opening section contains what for want of a better term I have called the dateline. It specifies the place the report was filed (SB [*Spezifische Begriffe*, "specific notions"] 1.2), the time it was filed (AB [*Allgemeine Begriffe*, "general notions"] 4.1), and then the name of the news agency (SB 13.7): *San Sebastian, 2. Januar (AP/dpa)*.

The final component of the opening section is the first sentence of the report proper, which encapsulates the main point of the report and takes the form of a declarative sentence in the perfect tense (SA 1.1.3). It will also contain time and place and set the topic for the rest of the report: *Ein hoher spanischer Offizier ist am Mittwoch in seinem Wagen erschossen worden*.

The middle section of the report consists of declarative sentences reporting facts (see SA 1.1.4 and 1.1.5) or speech (see SA 1.1.8). The text as a whole will show further features, which we can analyse, perhaps in the manner of Danes's (1964) three-level approach to syntax, as having a series of grammatical, semantic, and textual features.

On a textual level the main intentionality is to inform. The text is written without direct connection with the recipient in the public domain; there is embedding of one text into another (SA 1.1.9).

On a semantic level, we are dealing with factual information of—I use the terminology loosely—primarily denotative rather than connotative meaning relations (see Lyons 1977, volume I, pp.174ff.), so the value judgements which might find their way into a commentary would be out of place here. Modal particles, for example, which signal the writer's attitude to what is being reported, are rare. We shall have recourse to specific notions on the topic concerned (here GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION, INSTITUTIONS OF STATE, DIRECT ACTION); the general notions used are typically those of spatial and temporal relations. There is a lack of overt position markers or signposts, but the information is generally organized on principles of decreasing importance or increasing specificity; thematic progression is *via* derived theme with recursion, although other forms of progression are possible (see Eroms 1986, p.93).

A report such as this will have grammatical features, including extended attributes (*die mit Maschinenpistolen bewaffneten Täter*), prepositions or postpositions with the genitive (*der Polizei zufolge*), and so on. There will typically be a lack of modal particles.

Clearly, different types of report will require for the text frame to be modified. Aside from the factual reports in their long and short forms common in the quality press (respectively *Nachricht* and *Meldung*), this text type takes in human interest reports, discursive reports, reports made from a particular point of view (*Reportage*), and the expository type in which a problem is presented and discussed (*Problemdarstellung*); for further discussion, see Lüger (1983, pp.66-79). All of these sub-types are suitable for undergraduate work; the last-mentioned probably corresponds most closely to the traditional essay format.

The third type of text chosen to illustrate the concept of the text frame is the commentary. Like newspaper reports, these texts are readily available and deal with current arrairs in the target country, features which make them ideal for undergraduate use. Unlike reports, however, the intentionality of which is to inform with a minimum of personal input from the author, commentaries, even though they may use elements of reports as a framework, seek to persuade readers of the point of view of the writer. They consequently employ more complex argumentative structures in a more personal

way. This has an effect on the language used: assertions, value judgements and subjective proofs are common, as are sentence connectives which express adversative, causal, exemplifying and conclusive relations (Lüger 1983, p.83). Engel (1988, p.169) talks of quasi-dialogues (*fiktive Dialoge*), and written commentaries certainly have features in common with real dialogues, including the use of modal particles, rhetorical devices, and question-and-answer format. It remains to be seen whether other features of spoken language, such as shorter sentences, fewer compounds, and so on, are characteristic of this text type as well.

The text of a commentary which is representative of its type is given below:

(*Die Welt*, 22. August 1991)

DER KOMMENTAR

Sieg der Freiheit

Manfred Schell

Boris Jelzin gebührt der Friedensnobelpreis. Ohne seinen Mut, seine Energie und seine Klugheit hätte sich das Blatt in Moskau nicht gewendet. Die Flucht der Putschisten ist deshalb sein ganz persönlicher Triumph. Das Angebot des KGB, ihn zu einem Besuch bei Gorbatschow auf die Krim zu locken, war offenkundig der letzte Versuch der alten Garde, Jelzin auszuschalten. Glücklicherweise hat er sich nicht darauf eingelassen.

Nach diesen dramatischen Tagen ist Jelzin unumstritten die Nummer eins in der Sowjetunion. Sein Name steht für diese August-Revolution, mit der die Oktober-Revolution von 1917 endgültig überwunden wurde, an deren Ende der Apparat, die Armee und das KGB völlig deskreditiert sind. Die Soldaten haben nicht auf das eigene Volk geschossen, was viele befürchtet hatten. Auch der Sturm auf das russische Parlament blieb aus. Die Offiziere und

Soldaten haben ihre Loyalität dem Volkswillen gegeben, aber ihr Orientierungspunkt, ohne den es dieses gute Ende vielleicht nicht gegeben hätte, war Jelzin.

Gespannt darf man jetzt sein, was Gorbatschow erklären wird. Der frühere sowjetische Außenminister Schewardnadse hat noch mitten im Geschehen gesagt, er hoffe, daß Gorbatschow Opfer und nicht Urheber des Putsches sein wird. Diese Äußerung ließ aufhorchen. Und sofort ranken sich darum Spekulationen bis hin zu der Frage, ob Gorbatschow tatsächlich keinerlei Kenntnisse von dem Vorhaben hatte, als er in Urlaub fuhr. Und ob er an die Macht zurückkehren kann und wird.

Alle Welt—bis auf Fidel Castro und ein paar Chinesen—sind erleichtert über den Sieg der Freiheit. Die Ereignisse haben dem Westen aber auch gezeigt, wie stark in der Sowjetunion der Wille zur Freiheit und Reform inzwischen verankert ist. Das Rad ist wirklich nicht mehr zurückzudrehen. Das bedeutet für den Westen zusätzliche Verpflichtungen zur Hilfe und zwar schnell und großzügig—während im Inneren der Sowjetunion das große Aufräumen mit den Ewiggestrigen beginnen muß, als erstes beim KGB.

The text frame associated with this commentary is given in figure 3 on p.24.

Even though elements of reports are used to give a framework to the commentary (e.g. *Der frühere sowjetische Außenminister Schewardnadse hat [...] gesagt, er hoffe, daß Gorbatschow [...]*), the use of personal interventions by the writer, including assertions (e.g. *Boris Jelzin gebührt der Friedensnobelpreis*), idiomatic and colloquial expressions (*[...] hätte sich das Blatt in Moskau nicht gewendet; Das Rad ist wirklich nicht mehr zurückzudrehen; die alte Garde; mit den Ewiggestrigen*), generalizations (*Alle Welt—bis auf Fidel Castro und ein paar Chinesen—sind erleichtert [...]*), conclusions (e.g. *Das bedeutet für*

Figure 3

Text frame for writing a commentary in German


1
Opening
1
Title
2
(Long) S1
Thematization of content of article
SA 1.1.6
SA 1.1.2
2
S2...Sn
Grammatical level
- length of sentence
- lack of extended attributes (Gr. 4.1)
- main clauses with comma syndesis and coordination (Gr. 2.1)
- use of particles (Gr. 5.17)
- use of first person (Gr. 5.1), esp. pl.; question and answer format (Gr. 1.6)
- use of idiom, Modewörter (Gr. xx)
[...]
Semantic level
- register: current affairs with colloquial features (SB 4.1.1, SB 5)
- superstructure argumentative (SA 6.3.6.2)
- thematic progression via derived theme, split rheme (SA 6.3.8)
- use of value judgement (SA 2.6.2), generalization (SA 1.1.3), assertion (SA 1.1.2)
[...]
Pragmatic level
- written, but has features of spoken
- quasi-dialogue
- interpersonal
- public
-text intention: persuading someone of a point of view
[...]
3
Closing sentence summarizes content, draws conclusions and invites further consideration on the part of the reader
SA 6.3.9
SA 4.1.2
AB 7.15

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

den Westen [...]), and particles and constructions more typical of spoken German (e.g. *glücklicherweise; tatsächlich; offenkundig; Gespannt darf man jetzt sein [...]; und zwar [...]*) distinguish these texts clearly from reports. Indeed, even the report elements themselves are not free of value judgement, as the break in the use of Konjunktiv I (*er hoffe [...] sein wird*) in the report of the former foreign minister's statement illustrates. Incorporating the text elements for commentaries into a functional-notional syllabus shows perhaps more clearly than any other text type the need to integrate the description and analysis of both written and spoken German into the language teaching programme.

The text type commentary can be sub-divided into commentaries, *Glossen*, and reviews. The latter provide an interesting way to integrate language teaching and literary study: one possible strategy would be to read and/or perform a play, invite students to write a review of the text or the performance, and then compare their results with actual reviews which appeared in the press.

Like the exponents of the functions detailed in a traditional functional-notional syllabus, these text frames are not prescriptive statements. They do not imply, to take a single feature as an example, that every German report must begin with a declarative sentence in the perfect tense. But while it is undoubtedly true that reports also begin using the present tense, analysis of a corpus of reports has shown that the perfect tense is by far the most usual. It follows therefore that a learner who follows this "recipe" will produce one version of a convincing (albet conventional) German letter, report or commentary.

4.5 The syllabus specifies a range of functions and notions

As the functions used by native speakers correlate to some extent with text type, the list of functions specified in a university functional-notional syllabus will depend on the range of text types chosen as a result of the needs analysis. Subsequent definitional work on the basis of the target texts will then be required before a range of functions and notions and their likely exponents can be specified. However, it has already been argued that the Council of Europe's

Kontaktschwelle syllabus (Baldegger et al. 1984) will be likely to form the basis of any proposals for more senior cycles. Therefore, to assist the reader, a provisional list of functions and notions derived from *Kontaktschwelle* is given at the end of this paper (new or modified entries are indicated by an asterisk). The purpose of this section is therefore not to present a fully worked-out scheme, but to suggest areas where modification is necessary, the forms this might take, and a methodology by which it might be achieved.

The cyclical nature of the functional-notional syllabus means that no complex of speech acts can be ignored in a senior cycle. However, the fact that this syllabus concentrates on extended written discourse implies that major modifications would be necessary in functions which relate to that area of activity. Preliminary work suggests that modifications should be achieved in two ways: apart from translating and, to some extent, interpreting the labels given to the functions and notions for an English-speaking user, it appears to be necessary both to extend the range of productive exponents for functions already listed in *Kontaktschwelle*, and also to differentiate more finely between existing functions. The advent of affordable optical character recognition devices means that it is now possible to produce tailored corpora of texts on which a textlinguistic analysis can be based.

One example of expansion would be methods of address in letters. The entry in *Kontaktschwelle* (Baldegger et al. 1984, p.154) takes the following form:

5.1.7 ANREDE IN BRIEFEN

+ Liebe(r) | *Vorname*
| Herr/Frau/Familie + *Nachname*

+ Sehr geehrte(r) | Herr/Frau + *Nachname*
| Herr/Frau + *Titel* (+ *Nachname*)

+ Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren, (*bei nicht bekannten Adressaten*)

A modified entry might include information on when to include the surname with titles (it may, for instance be considered rude to include the surname with a professorial title), when to use a comma

or exclamation mark (reference to a new section on punctuation), reference to the opening sentence of a letter (SA 6.3.1.2), or other forms of address used in special circumstances (e.g. *Magnifizenz!*, when writing to the Rektor of a German university). A modified version is given below:

5.1.7 ADDRESSING PEOPLE IN LETTERS

+ Liebe(r) | *Vorname*,
| Herr/Frau/Familie + *Nachname*,/!

+ Sehr geehrte(r) | Herr/Frau + *Nachname*,/!
| Herr/Frau + *Titel* (+ *Nachname*),/!

Generalized titles usually require the surname: Dr. Personalized titles usually exclude the surname: Professor, Direktor, etc.

+ Magnifizenz! (*when writing to a University Rektor*)

+ Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren, (*when writing to people not known to you personally*)

On the use of <,> and <!>, see Part III Grammar, Punctuation

Similar expansion is needed, for example, in SA 5.2.4 SCHLUSSGRUSSFORMELN IN BRIEFEN. A modified SA 5.2.4 entitled ENDING A LETTER would include exponents such as *Mit (sehr/ganz) herzlichen Grüßen, Aufs herzlichst, Hochachtungsvoll!*, and the like, and reference to cases where the lettrer is being signed by a subordinate (*i.A., im Auftrage*), or the type of firm originating the letter. It is unlikely that these latter exponents would belong to a learner's productive repertoire.

If it is discovered that these entries are becoming too large and unwieldy, some restructuring of the headings may be necessary which differentiates more finely between the functions involved. For instance, the working list of functions given in the appendix has split *Kontaktschwelle*'s SA 6.3.11 ÄUSSERUNG ABSCHLIESSEN (Baldegger et al. 1984, p.168) into a series of endings related to text type under the general heading 6.3.11 ENDING A TEXT: the university syllabus would therefore include functions and their associated exponents for ending

a dialogue, a letter, and various types of reports and commentaries. Ending a text is just one aspect of its organization, but the need to restructure the *Kontaktschwelle* syllabus to capture the complex nature of the organization of written texts could be demonstrated in many different ways, as the summary indicates.

As regards general notions, modifications revolve around the number and range of productive exponents and the interrelationships between the general notions and the functions on the one hand and the grammar section on the other. This applies particularly to the relations listed under AB 7, which are used in the deployment of arguments, and the functions listed under section SA 6.3 (e.g. SA 6.3.6 REFERRING BACKWARDS AND FORWARDS IN A TEXT relates to the general notions of anaphora and cataphora detailed under AB 1); SA 6.3.6.1 ENUMERATING ITEMS relates directly to AB 5.1 NUMBER, etc.). The more detailed argumentative structures required in commentaries will entail greater specification of the semantic relations detailed under section AB 7, such as the notions of causality, purpose, deduction and conclusion. The semantic relations between the constituents of the text have implications not only for the presentation of SA 6.3 and AB 7, but also for the associated concepts in the grammar section (e.g. 1.7 ISOTOPIE, 1.8 SEMANTISCHE BEZIEHUNGEN ZWISCHEN SÄTZEN—Baldegger et al. 1984, pp.329f.). The concept of isotopy is in turn of relevance to the notion of thematic progression presented in the text frames, so that the interdependence of the various levels of the language production process (textlinguistic level, semantic level, grammatical level) is reflected in the interdependence of the corresponding components of the syllabus (text frames, functions and notions, grammatical support). In a similar way, the semantic relations with the verbal action (AB 7.3: AGENT, OBJECT, PLACE, TIME etc.) could be profitably linked with the grammatical treatment of the corresponding verbal complements (i.e. SUBJECT COMPLEMENT, ACCUSATIVE COMPLEMENT, LOCATIVE COMPLEMENT / DIRECTIONAL COMPLEMENT) and adjuncts (i.e. LOCATIONAL ADJUNCT, TEMPORAL ADJUNCT) given in the grammar section (see below).

As regards specific notions, their range will also depend on the text-types chosen. As students will usually be expected to spend a year at a German university, SB 11.2 UNTERRICHTSFÄCHER will serve to illustrate the type of modification envisaged. The entry in *Kontakt-*

schwelle is reproduced first for reference (Baldegger et al. 1984, p.297).

11.2 UNTERRICHTSFÄCHER

FACH		Fach
	+	in + *Fach*
		In Mathematik war ich nicht gut
LESEN	+	lesen
SCHREIBEN	+	schreiben
MATHEMATIK	+	Mathematik
		rechnen
WISSENSCHAFT	+	Wissenschaft
		wissenschaftlich
INTERESSENSGEBIETE	+	*Namen von Fächern, Gebieten, für die man sich besonders interessiert*
		z.B. Geographie, Musik, Chemie
SPRACHE	+	Sprache
		Welche Sprache haben Sie in der Schule gelernt?
		siehe auch SB 12 FREMDSPRACHE

A modified version would refer to notions specific to study at a German university, including the range of subjects studied (*Hauptfach, Nebenfach*), methods of assessment (*eine Klausur schreiben, einen Referat halten, die Dissertation, die mündliche Prüfung*) and the like. One possible scheme is given below.

11.2 SUBJECTS OF STUDY

SUBJECT	+	Fach, Hauptfach, (1., 2.), Nebenfach
	+	im Hauptfach + *Fach*
		Sie promoviert im Hauptfach Sprachwissenschaft
LESEN	+	lesen
SCHREIBEN	+	schreiben

	+	eine Klausur schreiben
	+	die schriftliche Prüfung
	+	die Dissertation
SPRECHEN	+	einen Referat halten
	+	die mündliche Prüfung
HÖREN	+	einen Vortrag hören
GERMANISTIK	+	Germanistik, Nordistik, Anglistik, usw.
WISSENSCHAFT	+	Wissenschaft wissenschaftlich
INTERESSENSGEBIETE	+	*Namen von Fächern, Gebieten, für die man sich besonders interessiert* z.B. moderne Literatur, Mundartenkunde, Textlinguistik
SPRACHE	+	Sprache Welche Sprache haben Sie studiert? *siehe auch SB 12* FREMDSPRACHE

Other sub-sections would specify notions relating to registration (*einschreiben, ordentlicher Student/Studierende*). Clearly, only detailed definitional work will be able to produce a useful list of specific notions. However, it is expected that a university course will both modify the specific notions already listed in *Kontaktschwelle* and add other, more specialized registers. Headings which would be modified include: SB 1 (BASIC PERSONAL INFORMATION), especially as this relates to form-filling and the production of a curriculum vitae; SB 2 (TYPES OF ACCOMMODATION), especially as this relates to student housing, rent contracts, and registration; SB 8 (HEALTH), especially as this relates to the German health service and EC relgulations; and SB 15 (AKTUALITÄT; THEMEN VON ALLGEMEINEM INTERESSE), which covers German politics and institutions. Further specific notions should cover the student's needs as far as the content of the course is concerned, which might include literature, linguistics, philosophy and the like. A very tentative list is given in the appendix.

4.6 The syllabus implies appropriate grammatical support

In order for teachers and students to work with the text frames, appropriate grammatical explanation and support must be provided. A detailed discussion of this question lies outside the scope of the present paper. Let me, however, note general characteristics.

First, the description will be text-based, rather than sentence-based. This means that, instead of proceeding from a description of word classes and inflections to a description of sentences and word order, in the manner of even the most progressive of traditional grammars (e.g. Durrell 1991), grammatical description is based on the organization of discourse and then on the progressive analysis of the elements which go to make it up (e.g. Engel 1988). In this way, the use of decontextualized sentences in grammatical description is avoided; material is always authentic. Furthermore, the description of text types forms a bridge between the text frames, the functions and notions, and the forms of the language.

Second, just as the teaching of grammar should arise out of the language material used in instruction rather than determining it, so the descriptive framework used for a language should be determined by the nature of the language itself, rather than being set in advance. The description of German suffered in the past from being shoe-horned into Latin grammatical categories; now the teaching of French and English grammar is spreading misconceptions and consumer-resistance among learners of German, which makes the effective teaching of German structures at university much more difficult. What does this mean in concrete terms? First, there is agreement among German grammarians both inside and outside Germany that the concept of functional sentence perspective offers a useful framework within which to describe relationships between sentences. Second, it is widely accepted that a dependency model offers the best descriptive framework to elucidate German grammatical structures above word and below sentence level (this is also the model chosen by the authors of *Kontaktschwelle*). Once these fundamental principles are accepted, the other features of appropriate grammatical support are matters of detail. However, differences between the survey offered in *Kontaktschwelle* and a university

syllabus would also involve, for instance, a fuller treatment of the word classes, especially the particles, and a much more detailed discussion of the genitive case, which is actually more frequent than the dative in many types of written German (Engel 1988, p.58).

Finally, a look-up index would provide easy access not only to the functions and notions (*via* a list of key words), but also to text-organizing strategies, grammatical terms, and constructions.

5 Summary

To summarize then, a university functional-notional syllabus is a practical proposition, not to say a necessity, in view of the currency of communicative syllabuses in school curricula. It constitutes a natural progression from junior-cycle syllabuses in using the same basic organization and similar categories, but differs from them in paying particular attention to complexes of speech acts and their organization rather than merely listing individual speech acts and appending a small section on dialogue structures. It concentrates on the written language rather than the spoken language and thus makes up for the deficit in the production of extended written discourse which undergraduates inherit from their language programmes in school. These notions of continuity and progression should pervade the university course itself: it is possible to imagine a three-stage syllabus corresponding to the conventional three-year course, in which students progress from the production of organizational through discursive to argumentative texts. A functional-notional syllabus can integrate German for Academic Purposes into the regular language teaching programme, and consequently give focus to what is all too often merely an *ad hoc* collection of course elements. The integration of academic teaching and language teaching, far from being a straitjacket for academic staff, can be liberating for both staff and students, for it means that staff can once again teach within their own fields of interest, and that our students will be able to function competently within their language discipline.

References

Adler, K., & B. Steffens, 1974: *Deutsch für die Mittelstufe, I: Texte und Übungen*. Munich: Hueber.

————, 1975a: *Deutsch für die Mittelstufe, I: Lösungen und Transkriptionen*. Munich: Hueber.

————, 1975b: *Deutsch für die Mittelstufe, I: Arbeitsheft*. Munich: Hueber.

Aufderstraße, H., H. Bock, M. Gerdes, & H. Müller, 1983: *Themen 1. Lehrwerk für Deutsch als Fremdsprache. Kursbuch*. Munich: Hueber.

Austin, J. L., 1975: *How to do things with words*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Baldegger, M., M. Müller, & G. Schneider, 1984: *Kontaktschwelle Deutsch als Fremdsprache*. 4th edition. Berlin & Munich: Langenscheidt. First published 1980, Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Bansleben, M., 1987a: *Perspektiven. Texte zur Kultur und Literatur*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

————, 1987b: *Perspektiven: Übungen zur Grammatik*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

de Beaugrande, R., & W. U. Dressler, 1981: *Einführung in die Textlinguistik*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Berwick, R., 1989: "Needs assessment in language programming: from theory to practice". In Johnson, pp.48-62.

Braun, K., L. Nieder & F. Schmöe, 1973: *Deutsch als Fremdsprache, Lehrerheft 1A*. Stuttgart: Klett.

————, 1974: *Deutsch als Fremdsprache, Hinweise für den Lehrer 1B*. Stuttgart: Klett.

Brindley, G., 1989: "The role of needs analysis in adult ESL programme design". In Johnson, pp.63-78.

Brown, G., & G. Yule, 1983: *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.

Bruner, J. S., 1977: *The Process of Education*. 2nd edition. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Coste, D., J. Courtillon, V. Ferenczi, M. Martins-Baltar, & E. Papo, 1976: *Un niveau-seuil*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Danes, F., 1964: "A three-level approach to syntax", *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague* 1, pp.225-240.

DES, 1990: *Modern Foreign Languages for ages 11 to 16. Proposals of the Secretary of State for Education and Science and the Secretary of State for Wales*. London: Department of Education and Science and the Welsh Office.

Durrell, M., 1991: *Hammer's German Grammar and Usage*. 2nd edition. London: Arnold.

van Ek, J. A., 1975: *The Threshold Level*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Republished 1980 as *Threshold Level English*. Oxford: Pergamon.

van Ek, J. A., & L. G. Alexander, 1977: *Waystage*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Engel, U., 1988: *Deutsche Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Groos.

Engel, U., et al., 1981: *Mannheimer Gutachten zu ausgewählten Lehrwerken Deutsch als Fremdsprache*. 2 vols. 5th edition. Heidelberg: Groos.

Eroms, H.-W., 1986: *Funktionale Satzperspektive*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Firth, R. A., M. Dane, & J. M. Harris, 1986: *Using Languages*. Manchester: Central Services Unit for Graduate Careers and Appointments Services.

Götze, L., 1990: "Deutsch als Fremdsprache—Ein Überblick über die Entwicklung des Faches in der Bundesrepublik", *German Teaching* 1, pp.16-20.

Griesbach, H., 1971: *Moderne Welt 2. Sachtexte mit Übungen (Deutsch für Fortgeschrittene)*. Munich: Hueber.

————, 1974a: *Sprachheft I*. 3rd edition. Munich: Hueber.

————, 1974b: *Deutsche Grammatik im Überblick*. 4th edition. Munich: Hueber.

————, 1974c: *Deutsch x 3: Lernbuch I, Lehrerheft I*. Berlin: Langenscheidt.

Hawkin, T., 1986: *Deutsch Express!*. London: BBC Publications.

Hindelang, G., 1983: *Einführung in die Sprechakttheorie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Johnson, R. K. (ed.), 1989: *The Second Language Curriculum*. Cambridge University Press.

Kaufmann, G., 1973: *Wie sag ich's auf deutsch? Übungen zu ausgewählten Kapiteln aus Grammatik und Wortschatz für Fortgeschrittene*. Munich: Hueber.

Kessler, H., 1974: *Deutsch für Ausländer: Lehrerheft*. Königswinter: Verlag für Sprachmethodik.

Klein, W., 1986: *Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.

Little, D., 1981-2: "Language teaching at university: a way forward for modern language courses", *FTA Bulletin* (Journal of the French Teachers' Association of Ireland, Dublin), No. 2, pp.19-25.

————, 1991: *Learner Autonomy I: Definitions, Issues and Problems*. Dublin: Authentik.

Little, D., H. Ó Murchú & D. Singleton, 1985a: *A Functional-Notional Syllabus for Adult Learners of Irish*. Dublin: Trinity College, Centre for Language and Communication Studies.

————, 1985b: *Towards a Communicative Curriculum for Irish*. Dublin: Trinity College, Centre for Language and Communication Studies, in association with Bord na Gaeilge.

Lüger, H.-H., 1983: *Pressesprache*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Lyons, J., 1977: *Semantics*. 2 vols. Cambridge University Press.

Mebus, G., A. Pauldrach, M. Rall, D. Rösler, 1987: *Sprachbrücke 1*. Stuttgart: Klett.

————, 1989: *Sprachbrücke 2*. Stuttgart: Klett.

Minsky, M., 1975: "A framework for representing knowledge". In *The Psychology of Computer Vision*, ed. P. H. Winston, pp.211-277. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Neuner, G., R. Schmidt, H. Wilms, & M. Zirkel, 1979: *Deutsch aktiv 1. Lehrbuch*. Berlin & Munich: Langenscheidt.

Phillips-Kerr, B., 1991: *Survey of Career Destinations. 1985 Modern Languages Graduates (Single and Joint Honours) of the University of Newcastle upon Tyne*. Newcastle upon Tyne: University of Newcastle upon Tyne Careers Advisory Service.

Porcher, L., M. Huart, & F. Mariet, 1980: *Adaptation de "Un niveau-seuil" pour des contextes scolaires*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Richterich, R., & J. L. Chancerel, 1980: *Identifying the Needs of Adults Learning a Foreign Language*. Oxford: Pergamon Press. First published 1977, Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Sandig, B., 1986: *Stilistik der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Schade, G., 1975: *Einführung in die deutsche Sprache der Wissenschaften*. Berlin: Schmidt.

Schulz, D., et al., 1974: *Auf Deutsch, bitte! Lehrerheft*. Munich: Hueber.

Singleton, D., 1990: "The TCD Modern Languages Research Project.

Objectives, instruments and preliminary results." CLCS Occasional Paper No. 26. Dublin: Trinity College, Centre for Language and Communication Studies.

Singleton, D., & D. Little, 1985: "Foreign languages at second level: defining a syllabus with particular reference to the needs of the senior cycle". CLCS Occasional Paper No. 12. Dublin: Trinity College, Centre for Language and Communication Studies.

Slagter, P., 1979: *Un nivel umbral*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Sowinski, B., 1983: *Textlinguistik*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Swales, J., 1989: "Service English programme design and opportunity cost". In Johnson, pp.79-90.

Trim, J., & K. Kohl, 1985: *Deutsch direkt!* London: BBC Publications.

Trim, J., K. Kohl, R. Ahrens-Kramer, & I. Sprankling, 1987: *Ganz spontan!* London: BBC Publications.

Weinrich, H., 1972: "Die Textpartitur als heuristische Methode", *Der Deutschunterricht* 24.4, pp.43-60.

White, R. V., 1988: *The ELT Curriculum. Design, Innovation and Management*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Widdowson, H. G., 1983: *Learning Purpose and Language Use*. Oxford University Press

Wilkins, D. A., 1976: *Notional Syllabuses*. Oxford University Press.

Wynants, A., 1985: *Drempelniveau. Nederlands als vreemde taal*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Yalden, J., 1983: *The Communicative Syllabus: Evolution, Design and Implementation*. Oxford: Pergamon.

© University of Dublin
Trinity College

Appendix

A provisional summary of functions, general notions and specific notions for a university German course, based on the categories listed in *Kontakstschwelle*. New categories are indicated by an asterisk.

5A: FUNCTIONS

1	IMPARTING AND SEEKING FACTUAL INFORMATION
1.1	REPORTING AND DESCRIBING
1.1.1	IDENTIFYING SOMEONE/SOMETHING
1.1.2	AFFIRMING SOMETHING
1.1.2.1	SAYING THAT SOMETHING IS TRUE
1.1.2.2	SAYING THAT SOMETHING IS UNTRUE
1.1.2.3	SAYING THAT SOMETHING IS SELF-EVIDENT
1.1.2.4	SAYING THAT SOMETHING IS CERTAIN
1.1.2.5	SAYING THAT SOMETHING IS OBVIOUS
1.1.2.6	SAYING THAT SOMETHING IS PROBABLE
1.1.2.7	SAYING THAT SOMETHING IS POSSIBLE
1.1.2.8	SAYING THAT SOMETHING IS UNCERTAIN
1.1.2.9	SAYING THAT SOMETHING IS IMPROBABLE
1.1.2.10	SAYING THAT SOMETHING IS IMPOSSIBLE
1.1.3	GENERALIZING
1.1.4	DESCRIBING SOMETHING
1.1.5	EXPLAINING SOMETHING
1.1.6	DRAWING ATTENTION TO SOMETHING
1.1.7	REMINDING SOMBONE OF SOMETHING
1.1.8	REPORTING EVENTS
1.1.9	REPORTING UTTERANCES
1.1.9.1	*REPORTING ATTITUDES
1.1.10	ANNOUNCING SOMETHING
1.1.11	SPEAKING HYPOTHETICALLY
1.1.12	ASSURING SOMBONE OF SOMETHING
1.2	QUESTIONING
1.2.1	ASKING FOR INFORMATION
1.2.2	ASKING FOR CONFIRMATION
1.3	ANSWERING
1.3.1	ANSWERING IN THE AFFIRMATIVE

1.3.2	ANSWERING IN THE NEGATIVE
1.3.3	GIVING INFORMATION IN ANSWER TO A QUESTION
1.3.4	SAYING THAT YOU DO NOT KNOW
1.3.5	REFUSING TO ANSWER
1.4	EXPRESSING ONE'S STATE OF MIND
1.4.1	EXPRESSING KNOWLEDGE
1.4.2	EXPRESSING CERTAINTY
1.4.3	EXPRESSING BELIEF
1.4.4	EXPRESSING CONJECTURE
1.4.5	EXPRESSING DOUBT
1.4.6	EXPRESSING IGNORANCE
1.5	ASKING ABOUT SOMEONE'S STATE OF MIND
1.5.1	ASKING WHETHER SOMEONE KNOWS SOMETHING
1.5.2	ASKING WHETHER SOMEONE IS CERTAIN OF SOMETHING
1.5.3	*ASKING WHETHER SOMEONE SUSPECTS SOMETHING
1.5.4	*ASKING WHETHER SOMEONE BELIEVES SOMETHING
1.5.5	*ASKING WHETHER SOMEONE IS DOUBTFUL ABOUT SOMETHING
2	VALUE JUDGEMENT, COMMENTARY
2.1	EXPRESSING OPINIONS
2.1.1	EXPRESSING OPINIONS AND VIEWS
2.1.2	TAKING SIDES
2.2	JUDGEMENT OF STATES, EVENTS, ACTIONS
2.2.1	PRAISING SOMETHING
2.2.2	APPROVING OF SOMETHING
2.2.3	THANKING SOMEONE FOR SOMETHING
2.2.4	SAYING THAT SOMETHING DOES NOT MATTER
2.2.5	CRITICIZING SOMETHING
2.2.6	DISAPPROVING OF SOMETHING
2.2.7	EXPRESSING REPROACH
2.2.8	EXPRESSING REGRET
2.3	JUSTIFYING SOMETHING
2.3.1	JUSTIFYING, GIVING REASONS FOR SOMETHING
2.3.2	ADMITTING SOMETHING
2.3.3	SAYING ONE IS SORRY
2.4	ASKING FOR SOMEONE TO STATE THEIR POSITION
2.4.1	ASKING SOMEONE THEIR OPINION

2.4.2	ASKING SOMEONE FOR A JUDGEMENT
2.4.3	LOOKING FOR AGREEMENT
2.4.4	DEMANDING JUSTIFICATION
2.5	AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT
2.5.1	EXPRESSING AGREEMENT
2.5.2	EXPRESSING DISAGREEMENT
2.5.3	CONTRADICTING SOMEONE
2.5.4	CONCEDING A POINT
2.5.5	OBJECTING TO SOMETHING
2.5.6	NOT CONCEDING A POINT
2.5.7	WITHDRAWING WHAT ONE HAS SAID
2.6	EXPRESSING AN EVALUATION OR VALUE JUDGEMENT
2.6.1	EXPRESSING INTEREST
2.6.2	EXPRESSING APPRECIATION
2.6.3	EXPRESSING WISHFUL THINKING
2.6.4	EXPRESSING PREFERENCE
2.6.5	EXPRESSING INDIFFERENCE
2.6.6	EXPRESSING DISREGARD, DISLIKE
2.6.7	EXPRESSING DISINTERESTEDNESS
2.7	ASKING FOR AN EVALUATION OR A VALUE JUDGEMENT
2.7.1	ASKING WHETHER SOMEONE IS INTERESTED
2.7.2	ASKING WHETHER SOMEONE IS APPRECIATIVE
2.7.3	ASKING ABOUT SOMEONE'S WISHES
2.7.4	ASKING ABOUT SOMEONE'S PREFERENCES
3	EXPRESSING FEELINGS
3.1	EXPRESSING LIKING
3.2	EXPRESSING SYMPATHY
3.3	EXPRESSING ANTIPATHY
3.4	EXPRESSING THANKS
3.5	EXPRESSING ENTHUSIASM
3.6	EXPRESSING JOY
3.7	EXPRESSING SATISFACTION
3.8	EXPRESSING SURPRISE

3.9	EXPRESSING RELIEF
3.10	EXPRESSING DISAPPOINTMENT
3.11	EXPRESSING BEWILDERMENT
3.12	EXPRESSING IMPERTURBABILITY
3.13	EXPRESSING INDIFFERENCE
3.14	EXPRESSING RESIGNATION
3.15	EXPRESSING PERPLEXITY
3.16	EXPRESSING HOPE
3.17	EXPRESSING FEAR
3.18	EXPRESSING GRIEF
3.19	EXPRESSING SADNESS
3.20	EXPRESSING DISSATISFACTION
3.21	EXPRESSING BOREDOM
3.22	EXPRESSING IMPATIENCE
3.23	EXPRESSING IRRITATION
3.24	EXPRESSING ABHORRENCE
3.25	EXPRESSING PAIN
4	GETTING PEOPLE TO DO THINGS
4.1	INITIATING ACTION
4.1.1	SUGGESTING A COURSE OF ACTION
4.1.2	SUGGESTING A COMMON COURSE OF ACTION
4.1.3	REQUESTING
4.1.4	ASKING FOR HELP
4.1.5	CALLING FOR HELP
4.1.6	EXPRESSING WISHES
4.1.7	ASKING FOR SOMETHING IN A SHOP
4.1.8	ORDERING SOMETHING IN A RESTAURANT
4.1.9	GIVING PEOPLE THINGS TO DO
4.1.10	GIVING COMMANDS
4.1.11	GIVING INSTRUCTIONS
4.1.12	COMPLAINING

4.1.13	PUTTING PRESSURE ON PEOPLE
4.1.14	WARNING
4.1.15	THREATENING
4.1.16	ENCOURAGING
4.1.17	SUGGESTING
4.1.18	ADVISING
4.2	GIVING PERMISSION
4.2.1	GIVING PERMISSION
4.2.2	EXCUSING SOMEONE FROM SOMETHING
4.2.3	REFUSING PERMISSION
4.2.4	REFUSING TO EXCUSE SOMEONE FROM SOMETHING
4.3	CONSULTING
4.3.1	ASKING FOR PERMISSION
4.3.2	ASKING TO BE EXCUSED FROM SOMETHING
4.3.3	ASKING FOR SUGGESTIONS
4.3.4	ASKING FOR ADVICE
4.3.5	ASKING FOR INSTRUCTIONS
4.4	OFFERING TO DO SOMETHING
4.4.1	ASKING ABOUT PEOPLE'S WISHES
4.4.2	OFFERING THINGS
4.4.3	OFFERING TO DO SOMETHING
4.4.4	OFFERING HELP
4.4.5	INVITING SOMEONE TO DO SOMETHING
4.4.6	PROMISING TO DO SOMETHING
4.5	GIVING ASSENT
4.5.1	GIVING ASSENT
4.5.2	MAKING AN AGREEMENT
4.5.3	ACCEPTING AN OFFER
4.5.4	REFUSING ASSENT
4.5.5	DECLINING AN OFFER
4.5.6	HESITATING
4.6	EXPRESSING STATES OF MIND RELATED TO FUTURE ACTION
4.6.1	INTENTION
4.6.1.1	SAYING THAT YOU INTEND TO DO SOMETHING
4.6.1.2	SAYING THAT YOU ARE DETERMINED TO DO SOMETHING
4.6.1.3	SAYING THAT YOU ARE UNDECIDED

4.6.1.4	EXPRESSING LACK OF FIXED INTENTION
4.6.1.5	SAYING THAT YOU REFUSE TO DO SOMETHING
4.6.2	MOTIVATION
4.6.2.1	SAYING WHAT YOU WISH TO DO
4.6.2.2	SAYING WHAT YOU WOULD RATHER DO
4.6.2.3	SAYING WHY YOU ARE GOING TO DO SOMETHING
4.6.3	FEASIBILITY
4.6.3.1	EXPRESSING THE ABILITY TO DO SOMETHING
4.6.3.2	EXPRESSING THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR FUTURE ACTION
4.6.3.3	EXPRESSING READINESS TO DO SOMETHING
4.6.3.4	EXPRESSING THE FEASIBILITY OF FUTURE ACTION
4.6.3.5	EXPRESSING THE UNFEASIBILITY OF FUTURE ACTION
4.6.3.6	SAYING THAT YOU CANNOT DO SOMETHING
4.6.3.7	EXPRESSING LACK OF RESPONSIBILITY
4.6.3.8	EXPRESSING INABILITY
4.6.4	DUTY
4.6.4.1	SAYING THAT IT IS YOUR DUTY TO DO SOMETHING
4.6.4.2	SAYING THAT IT IS FORBIDDEN TO DO SOMETHING
4.6.4.3	SAYING THAT IT IS ALLOWED TO DO SOMETHING
4.7	ASKING ABOUT STATES OF MIND RELATED TO FUTURE ACTION
4.7.1	INTENTION
4.7.1.1	ASKING ABOUT SOMEONE'S INTENTIONS
4.7.1.2	ASKING ABOUT SOMEONE'S DECISION
4.7.2	MOTIVATION
4.7.2.1	ASKING WHAT SOMEONE WANTS TO DO
4.7.2.2	ASKING WHAT SOMEONE WOULD RATHER DO
4.7.2.3	ASKING WHY SOMEONE IS DOING SOMETHING
4.7.3	FEASIBILITY
4.7.3.1	ASKING ABOUT ABILITY
4.7.3.2	ASKING ABOUT RESPONSIBILITY
4.7.3.3	ASKING ABOUT READINESS
4.7.3.4	ASKING ABOUT FEASIBILITY
4.7.4	DUTY
4.7.4.1	ASKING WHETHER YOU HAVE TO DO SOMETHING
4.7.4.2	ASKING WHETHER IT IS ALLOWED TO DO SOMETHING

5	SOCIAL CONVENTIONS
5.1	ESTABLISHING CONTACT
5.1.1.1	GREETING SOMEONE
5.1.1.2	REPLYING TO A GREETING
5.1.2.1	ASKING HOW SOMEONE IS
5.1.2.2	SAYING HOW YOU ARE
5.1.3.1	INTRODUCING YOURSELF
5.1.3.2	INTRODUCING SOMEONE
5.1.3.3	REPLYING TO AN INTRODUCTION
5.1.4.1	SPEAKING TO PEOPLE
5.1.4.2	REACTING WHEN SPOKEN TO
5.1.5.1	ASKING WHETHER YOU CAN COME IN
5.1.5.2	ASKING SOMEONE IN
5.1.6.1	MAKING A TELEPHONE CALL
5.1.6.2	ANSWERING THE TELEPHONE
5.1.7	ADDRESSING PEOPLE IN LETTERS
5.1.8	*MAKING APPOINTMENTS
5.2	LEAVE-TAKING
5.2.1	ORAL LEAVE-TAKING
5.2.2.1	ASKING TO BE REMEMBERED TO SOMEONE
5.2.2.2	PROMISING TO REMEMBER SOMEONE TO A THIRD PARTY
5.2.3.1	INITIATING THE END OF A TELEPHONE CALL
5.2.3.2	RESPONDING TO SOMEONE ENDING A TELEPHONE CALL
5.2.4	VALEDICTORY GREETINGS IN LETTERS
5.3	MAINTAINING CONTACT
5.3.1.1	APOLOGIZING
5.3.1.2	RESPONDING TO AN APOLOGY
5.3.2.1	THANKING
5.3.2.2	RESPONDING TO THANKS
5.3.3.1	GIVING COMPLIMENTS
5.3.3.2	RESPONDING TO COMPLIMENTS
5.3.4.1	CONGRATULATING
5.3.4.2	RESPONDING TO CONGRATULATIONS
5.3.5.1	EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES
5.3.5.2	RESPONDING TO CONDOLENCES
5.3.6.1	WISHING PEOPLE WELL
5.3.6.2	RESPONDING TO GOOD WISHES
5.3.7.1	DRINKING SOMEOBODY'S HEALTH

5.3.7.2	RESPONDING TO A TOAST
6	STEERING AND STRUCTURING TEXTS
6.1	DIALOGUE
6.1.1	INITIATING/JOINING A CONVERSATION
6.1.2	INTERRUPTING SOMEONE
6.1.3	SAYING THAT YOU HAVE NOT YET FINISHED
6.1.4	GETTING A HEARER'S ATTENTION
6.1.5	ALLOWING SOMEONE ELSE TO SPEAK
6.1.6	ASKING SOMEONE ELSE TO SPEAK
6.1.7	SIGNALLING THAT YOU ARE FOLLOWING THE CONVERSATION
6.1.8	ASKING SOMEONE TO BE QUIET
6.2	MAKING SURE THAT YOU UNDERSTAND
6.2.1	ASKING FOR CONFIRMATION
6.2.2	ASKING THE SPEAKER TO REPEAT
6.2.3	ASKING THE SPEAKER TO SPELL SOMETHING
6.2.4	SIGNALLING THAT YOU HAVE NOT UNDERSTOOD
6.2.5	ASKING FOR EXPLANATION, COMMENT
6.2.6	ASKING FOR AMPLIFICATION
6.2.7	SPELLING
6.2.8	SIGNALLING THAT YOU HAVE UNDERSTOOD
6.2.9	ASKING WHETHER THE HEARER CAN HEAR YOU
6.2.10	ASKING WHETHER THE HEARER UNDERSTANDS WHAT YOU ARE SAYING
6.2.11	EXPLAINING, COMMENTING ON SOMETHING YOU HAVE SAID
6.3	STRUCTURING A TEXT
6.3.1	BEGINNING A TEXT
6.3.1.1	*BEGINNING A DIALOGUE
6.3.1.2	*BEGINNING A LETTER
6.3.1.2.1	*BEGINNING A PERSONAL LETTER
6.3.1.2.2	*BEGINNING A BUSINESS LETTER
6.3.1.3	*BEGINNING A REPORT
6.3.1.3.1	*BEGINNING A SHORT REPORT
6.3.1.3.2	*BEGINNING A LONG REPORT
6.3.1.3.3	*BEGINNING A DISCURSIVE REPORT (*PROBLEMDARSTELLUNG*)

6.3.1.4	*BEGINNING A COMMENTARY
6.3.1.4.1	*BEGINNING A *GLOSSE*
6.3.1.4.2	*BEGINNING A REVIEW
6.3.2	HESITATING, SEARCHING FOR WORDS
6.3.3	ASKING FOR HELP IN FINDING THE RIGHT WORD
6.3.4	CORRECTING WHAT YOU HAVE SAID
6.3.5	PARAPHRASING
6.3.6	*REFERRING BACKWARDS AND FORWARDS IN A TEXT
6.3.6.1	*ENUMERATING ITEMS
6.3.6.2	*PRESENTING AN ARGUMENT
6.3.7	GIVING AN EXAMPLE
6.3.8	CHANGING THE SUBJECT
6.3.9	SUMMARIZING
6.3.10	STRESSING SOMETHING
6.3.11	*ENDING A TEXT
6.3.11.1	*ENDING A DIALOGUE
6.3.11.2	*ENDING A LETTER
6.3.11.2.1	*ENDING A PERSONAL LETTER
6.3.11.2.2	*ENDING A BUSINESS LETTER
6.3.11.3	*ENDING A REPORT
6.3.11.3.1	*ENDING A SHORT REPORT
6.3.11.3.2	*ENDING A LONG REPORT
6.3.11.3.3	*ENDING A DISCURSIVE REPORT (*PROBLEMDARSTELLUNG*)
6.3.11.4	*ENDING A COMMENTARY
6.3.11.4.1	*ENDING A COMMENTARY
6.3.11.4.2	*ENDING A GLOSSE
6.3.11.4.3	*ENDING A REVIEW

AB: GENERAL NOTIONS

1	REFERENCE (THINGS, PERSONS, CONCEPTS, SITUATIONS) INCLUDING DEIXIS, PROFORMS, PHORIC WORDS
2	EXISTENCE
2.1	BEING/NOT BEING
2.2	PRESENCE/ABSENCE

2.3	AVAILABILITY/NON-AVAILABILITY
2.4	OCCURRENCE/NON-OCCURRENCE
3	SPATIAL EXTENT
3.1	POSITION
3.1.1	QUIESCENT STATE
3.1.2	PLACE, POSITION
3.1.3	RELATIVE POSITION
3.1.4	PROXIMITY, DISTANCE
3.2	MOTION
3.2.1	MOTION, PROGRESS
3.2.2	MOTION WITH PERSONS AND THINGS
3.2.3	DIRECTION OF MOTION
3.2.4	PLACE TO WHERE
3.2.5	PLACE FROM WHERE
3.2.6	ROUTE
3.3	DIMENSION
3.3.1	SIZE
3.3.2	LINEAR MEASUREMENT
3.3.3	SQUARE MEASUREMENT
3.3.4	VOLUME
3.3.5	WEIGHT
4	TEMPORAL EXTENT
4.1	POINT IN, PEROD OF TIME
4.2	ANTERIORITY
4.3	POSTERIORITY
4.4	SEQUENCE
4.5	SIMULTANEITY
4.6	FUTURE TIME REFERENCE
4.7	PRESENT TIME REFERENCE
4.8	PAST TIME REFERENCE
4.9	REFERENCE WITHOUT TIME FOCUS

4.10	EARLINESS, LATENESS
4.11	DURATION OF TIME
4.12	BEGINNING OF ACTION, STATE, PROCESS
4.13	CONTINUATION OF ACTION, STATE, PROCESS
4.14	DURATION OF ACTION, STATE, PROCESS
4.15	END OF ACTION, STATE, PROCESS
4.16	CHANGE AND PERMANENCE
4.17	SPEED
4.18	FREQUENCY
4.19	REPETITION
5	QUANTITY
5.1	NUMBER
5.2	QUANTITY
5.3	DEGREE
6	QUALITY
6.1	PHYSICAL FEATURES
6.1.1	FORM
6.1.2	MEASUREMENTS
6.1.2.1	EXTENT
6.1.2.2	TEMPERATURE
6.1.3	COLOUR
6.1.4	MATERIAL
6.1.5	TEXTURE, QUALITY OF MATERIALS
6.1.6	HUMIDITY
6.1.7	VISIBILITY
6.1.8	AUDIBILITY
6.1.9	TASTE
6.1.10	SMELL
6.1.11	AGE
6.1.12	EXTERNAL STATE, OPERATIONAL/NON-OPERATIONAL
6.2	PERSONAL QUALITIES

6.2.1	COGNITIVE ABILITIES
6.2.2	EMOTIONAL STATE
6.2.3	WANTING
6.2.4	COMMUNICATIVE ABILITIES
6.2.5	MORAL STATE
6.3	EVALUATION
6.3.1	VALUE, PRICE
6.3.2	QUALITY
6.3.3	AESTHETIC QUALITY
6.3.4	ACCEPTABILITY
6.3.4.1	*CORRECTNESS
6.3.5	ADEQUACY
6.3.6	TRUTH VALUE, RIGHTNESS/WRONGNESS
6.3.7	NORMALITY
6.3.8	DESIRABILITY
6.3.9	UTILITY
6.3.10	IMPORTANCE
6.3.11	NECESSITY
6.3.12	POSSIBILITY
6.3.13	ABILITY
6.3.14	DIFFICULTY
6.3.15	SUCCESS
7	RELATIONS
7.1	SPATIAL RELATIONS
7.2	TEMPORAL RELATIONS
7.3	ACTION/PROCESS/STATE RELATIONS
7.3.1	AGENTIVE
7.3.2	OBJECTIVE
7.3.3	BENEFACTIVE
7.3.4	INSTRUMENTAL
7.3.5	ADVERBIAL
7.3.6	LOCATIVE
7.3.6.1	*LOCATIVE
7.3.6.2	*DIRECTIONAL
7.3.7	TEMPORAL
7.4	ATTRIBUTION

7.5	CONTRASTIVE RELATIONS
7.5.1	IDENTITY
7.5.2	COMPARISON
7.6	POSSESSIVE RELATIONS
7.6.1	POSSESSION
7.6.2	PART-WHOLE
7.7	CONJUNCTION
7.8	DISJUNCTION
7.9	INCLUSION/EXCLUSION
7.10	OPPOSITION, QUALIFICATION
7.11	CAUSALITY: REASON, CAUSE
7.12	CAUSALITY: RESULT, EFFECT
7.13	PURPOSE
7.14	CONDITIONAL RELATIONS
7.15	DEDUCTION, CONCLUSION

SB: SPECIFIC NOTIONS

1	PERSONAL INFORMATION
2	ACCOMMODATION
3	ENVIRONMENT
4	TRAVEL
5	FOOD AND DRINK
6	SHOPPING
7	PUBLIC AND PRIVATE UTILITIES
8	HEALTH AND HYGIENE

9	PERCEPTION, MOVEMENT AND SKILLS
10	CAREERS
11	EDUCATION
11.1	*UNIVERSITY STUDY
11.2	*FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDY
11.3	*LITERATURE
11.3.1	*PERIODS OF LITERATURE
11.3.1.1	*THE MEDIEVAL PERIOD
11.3.1.2	*THE REFORMATION
11.3.1.3	*THE BAROQUE
	ETC.
11.4	*LINGUISTICS
11.4.1	*DESCRIPTIVE LINGUISTICS
11.4.1.1	*LEVELS OF LANGUAGE
	ETC.
12	FOREIGN LANGUAGES
13	LEISURE ACTIVITIES
14	PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS
15	CURRENT AFFAIRS
15.1	POLITICS (= *Kontaktschwelle* SB 15.1)
15.2	SOCIAL ISSUES (= *Kontaktschwelle* SB 15.2)
15.3	ECONOMICS (= *Kontaktschwelle* SB 15.2)
16	*THE MEDIA
16.1	NEWSPAPERS (= *Kontaktschwelle* SB 13.7)
16.2	TELEVISION AND RADIO (= *Kontaktschwelle* SB 13.6)

Autumn 1986

17. Ailbhe Ní Chasaide& Eugene Davis, *A data-processing system for quantitative analysis in speech production* (28pp.)
18. Seán M. Devitt, *Learning a foreign language through the media* (69pp.)
19. Meriel Bloor & Thomas Bloor, *Languages for specific purposes: practice and theory* (34pp.)

Spring 1988

20. D. G. Little & D. M. Singleton, *Authentic materials and the role of fixed support in language teaching: towards a manual for language learners* (26pp.)

Spring 1989

21. Seán M. Devitt, *Classroom discourse: its nature and its potential for language learning* (72pp.)
22. V. J. Cook, *The relevance of grammar in the applied linguistics of language teaching* (43pp.)

Spring 1990

23. Sera De Vriendt & Pete Van de Craen, *Bilingualism in Belgium: a history and an appraisal* (52pp.)
24. David Singleton, *The cross-linguistic factor in second language learning: a report on some small-scale studies recently conducted at the CLCS* (20pp.)

Autumn 1990

25. Paul Farrell, *Vocabulary in ESP: a lexical analysis of the English of electronics and a study of semi-technical vocabulary* (82pp.)
26. David Singleton, *The TCD Modern Languages Research Project: objectives, instruments and preliminary results* (19pp.)
27. Federica Scarpa, *Contrastive analysis and second language learners' errors: an analysis of C-test data elicited from beginners in Italian* (47pp.)

Spring 1991

28. Jennifer Ridley, *Strategic competence in second language performance: a study of four advanced learners* (95pp.)
29. Susan Abbey, *A case for on-going evaluation in English language teaching projects* (43pp.)

Spring 1992

30. Frank Donoghue, *Teachers' guides: a review of their function* (51pp.)
31. Barbara Byrne, *Relevance Theory and the language of advertising* (76pp.)

Summer 1992

32. Jonathan West, *The development of a functional-notional syllabus for university German courses* (50pp.)
33. James Mannes Bourke, *The case for problem solving in second language learning* (23pp.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE